DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 580 HE 000 741

By-Rovetch, Warren

SMSA America and the Urbanized Campus.

American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date 4 Mar 69

Note-5p; Paper presented at the American Association for Higher Education's 24th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., March 2-5, 1969

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.35

Descriptors-•Building Design, •Higher Education, •Physical Design Needs, Social Responsibility, •Urban Environment, •Urban Universities

The Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) includes a central city of at least 50,000 people in an area of metropolitan character where at least three fourths of employment is nonagricultural. Settlements in which a majority of persons live are "contiguous civil divisions" radiating from the city and having densities of no fewer than 150 persons per square mile. SMSA's break down into numerous subdivisions each of which produces its own complex of unresolved problems and students. The students and problems, in turn, generate questions concerning their relationship to colleges and universities, although neither the composition of the urban impact nor the opportunities for institutional response are identical. Few colleges or universities are located in cities of 1,000,000 or more and the "new, organic urban campus" has not yet been created. Planning the relevant urban institution should take into account traffic moving in and out of the campus and the patterns, needs and commerce of urban man. Planners could utilize design concepts such as: extension of the campus perimeter, establishment of small, many-purpose sub-centers, and horizontal zoning of buildings based on velocity of circulation. They should consider: the separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, the spending potential of staff and students, housing, and primarily, how the college affects the neighborhood. (JS)

ED029580

ROVETCH, WARREN

SMSA AMERICA AND THE URBANIZED CAMPUS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 000 741

(12)

Special Session III
Tuesday Afternoon, March 4

SMSA AMERICA AND THE URBANIZED CAMPUS*

Warren Rovetch
President
Campus Facilities Associates

The multiple impacts of an urbanizing society are buffeting and transforming higher education. The problems of race and riot are most evident and profound in the core of the central city. However, for a nation that was born in the country, grew up in the city and has for some time been moving to the suburbs, the urban reality is far more complex a question than a matter of black and white. The homogenized suburb generates its own brand of problems as it searches for urban amenities or workable substitutes. In texture, substance and need for chemical enrichment, suburban life is a bit like white bread, which also while much maligned remains in great demand.

Our definition of urban all too often focuses on the central city and problems at its core. The truth can be found in a sort of conglomerate that the Bureau of Census calls a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. This is a central city of at least 50,000 in an area of metropolitan character where at least three fourths of employment is non-agricultural. A majority of persons outside the central city live in settlements called "contiguous civil divisions" radiating from the central city with densities no less than 150 persons per square mile.

Statistically in 1968, 65 percent of 174 million white and 24 million nonwhite Americans lived in 212 SMSA's. These were the SMSA's defined in the 1960 Census. Given areas that have grown into SMSA's since the current percent is probably closer to 70 or 75. Of these, 45 percent live in the central cities and 55 percent in the suburban rings that surround them. Broken down into white and nonwhite terms, 87 percent of the SMSAites are white, 41 percent of them live in the city with the evergrowing number fleeing to the suburbs amounting to 59 percent. This is a 27 percent increase over the 1960 proportions.

Of the 13 percent nonwhite SMSAites, 76 percent live in the central city. While the numbers are small, the growth of nonwhites in the suburban ring is at a rate nearly 50 percent greater than whites, something that fervent escapists might well note.

In numbers, of the 128 million in 212 metropolitan areas, 111 million are white and 17 million are not. In the SMSA central cities with 58 million, 45 million are white and 13 million are not. In the suburban rings, 66 million of the 70 million total are white and 4 million are not.

These numbers translate into slum, ghetto, middle class black and white neighborhoods tract, strip development, interchange center, suburb and exurb. These in various compositions are urban America. Each piece produces students who bring their slice of life to the campus and each piece produces its complex of unresolved problems.

---

*Remarks presented to Special Session III on "Planning the architecture for the future urban institution of higher education" at the 24th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Tuesday afternoon, March 4. Permission to quote restricted.

Together students and problems produce questions of the relationship of each college and university to all of this.

The point is that the nature and rate or urbanization comprise the force and reality. The overexperienced black youth in revolt is one part. The overprotected, underexperienced suburban white seeking some way of being turned on is another. In between are an infinite range of others. And facing this representation of SMSA America are administrators and planners who are largely products of an earlier far less urban America--when the only thing we had to fear was the A-Bomb itself and higher education's response was a surge in international studies.

If all the "troublemakers" would go away, all would still not be well.

Because the vast majority of students come from an America that is 75 percent urban, even the quiet campus in the country is now visited with the distress and conflicts stemming from both the enraged core city or the lonely, unexciting suburb.

One Point should be clear. Neither the composition of the urban impact nor the opportunities or obligations for response are identical from one campus to another. To be both distinguished and distinguishable within the mass of educational institutions, any one college's choice of what it values, what it will teach and what it will look like must be guided by a special combination of factors.

A look at the location of existing campuses shows a most interesting dispersal. First, only about 8 percent of colleges and universities are in cities of one million or more in contrast to about 15 percent of the population. Relatively few of the "city" colleges are actually at the urban core. The total distribution of colleges and cities liiks like this.

City Population	Colleges as % of Total
1 million or more	7.8
500,000 to 1 million	8.5
250,000 to 500,000	6.9
100,000 to 250,000	10.4
50,000 to 100,000	9.9
25,000 to 50,000	11.9
10,000 to 25,000	18.0
5,000 to 10,000	11.4
2,500 to 5,000	6.4
2,500 or less	9.0

The main force of American higher education is physically and psychologically oriented to the America that was born in the country. It is not surprising then to find, as the Educational Facilities Laboratories has pointed out, that there has not yet been produced "an effective physical plan to meet the realities of institutional life in today's cities....nowhere have we created the new, organic urban campus and, at the moment, nowhere has a college or university made a firm commitment to do so."

Perhaps the reason is that we have looked at the central city as something apart from the SMSA reality. Perhaps if all institutions focused accurately on their own urban condition, the resulting sensitivity and general understanding would produce more meaningful specific applications. I believe this is termed improving

the state-of-the-art.

Thus while I will tend to speak to the core city campus question I want to try and address myself to the physical design question in terms that have meaning for old campuses and new, small and large, in the towns as well as the cities.

First is the importance of understanding the college and its residents as a community, a special kind of company town that is contiguous with or surrounded by another city or town. The college community is diverse in age, maturity, sex, marital status and academic and personal interests. It has students, faculty, professionals, administrators and service workers. It has classes, and programs and all the people in it live somewhere and spend money. Some of the learning, living and spending takes place on campus and much of it spills over into contiguous areas, ordinarily called off-campus.

This relationship with the environment needs to be enhanced. The traffic of an urban campus is both in and out, both as to student movement and the involvement of the community. Equally fundamental are the ways in which the campus and the community around it reflect the patterns and needs, and the commerce of urban man. The old notion of one student union, one place to eat, one place to coffee, one place to shop is stilted and monastic.

These two principles of in and out traffic and a more natural flow of commerce translate into basic planning concepts, which in turn produce significant opportunities for the campus that opts for urban relevance.

One planning concept is the extended perimeter: getting away from the notion of the neat circular or rectangular plot of land, and instead extending fingers into toe surrounding city wherever possible; getting the maxinum front footage to maximize contact between the "campus" and its surrounding area. This avoids the fortress campus, enlarges the development or redevelopment opportunities for the campus environment, improves the tax base of campus-related land and permits a flexible pattern of campus growth.

Another concept is the multi-nucleared sub-center plan: making it possible for people to drink coffee or read books or study or talk or eat or attend classes or whatever in a number of medium and small sub-centers rather than in one large formal center. The campus however designed does not function as a neat, logical organism with a library at the center. It should be people in a variety of clusters and groups with different styles and patterns of activity.

The third concept is the mixed use of land through the horizontal zoning of buildings, based on velocity of circulation. High velocity uses are, for instance, convenience/commercial and classrooms; they belong on street levels or, for classrcoms, on walk-up floors. Medium velocity uses, such as faculty offices, research laboratories and conference rooms, can be on walk-up and low elevator floors. Low velocity uses, such as business offices or living quarters, can be on top floors or in towers. Not including housing, medium and low velocity areas will ordinarily represent one-third to one-half of total campus square footage. Mixed use permits high density utilization of land without crowding. Can you visualize a building that has snack bars and a browsing bookstore at courtyard level, and classrooms and offices above?

Another consideration of special concern to the campus in the large city is the separation of pedestrian and vehicle circulation. An interlocking system of

pedestrian streets on the ground and in buildings bridging the streets permits living with the reality of urban automobile traffic without subjugating the university to the tyranny of it. It permits use of valuable air space over streets, provides for protected circulation on winter days, and enlarges the opportunities for campus interaction, while avoiding the lack of human scale and the disadvantages of the massive mega-structure.

Whether it intends it or not, a college or university exerts a powerful economic force. Translating a full time equivalent student into a unit of measure that also includes faculty and staff and their families and the families of married students, our studies show, on the average, that one daytime FTE represents an expenditure of $5,000 per year apart from education and housing costs and apart from buying by the college. Thus, for example, an FTE of 11,000 will mean $55 million in personal buying. This includes items that range from $600,000 for newspapers, magazines and paperbacks to $4 million on meals, snacks and beverages.

That spending is going to be done; the question confronting the college is: how much of it will be done on campus, how much near the campus, how much elsewhere? It doesn't have to try to make a profit from it; but it does have to recognize buying power as one of the potentially explosive development forces and facts of life that shape the campus and its environment.

The second major area in which the campus and community mix it up in the real world is in housing. Few campuses today house all single or many married resident students. Nor do many students, juniors and above in particular want to live in the stilted campus dormitory--even with visiting privileges. At so called commuting institutions we have found at least half the students living away from home. Where do they live? Wherever they can which accounts for the long life of ancient slums and the instant creation of new slums for new campuses.

It is time for colleges and universities to become joint venturers with their host cities and with the private sector in capturing the massive thrust of spending and housing to create a positive--which does not mean dull--campus environment and be an invigorating force for the renewal of the neighborhood. In many college towns the word community could substitute for neighborhood.

The sense of neighborhood is of tremendous importance for the vital campus that recognizes the urban reality of its students and itself. The college or university can affect the entire city; a major university will affect the nation and the world. But mostly and firstly, a campus will affect its neighborhood; and success as a vital institution will be measured in the first instance by what effect it has on its neighborhood, and, of course, by what effect the neighborhood has on it.

Meaningful answers, I believe, are to be found in a merging of campus and town planning. The academic planner must not only know that his planning will affect the city--he must embrace this as an opportunity and control the thrust of this influence. There is no need to fog the borders, so that one cannot tell where the campus ends and the city begins; but there is great and clamoring need to make the fit between campus and community close and active. The sooner educators adopt this concept, the sooner we will reach the still evasive goal of urban reality in campus design and development.